



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,813	01/08/2004	Osama Othman Mostaeen Al-Khateeb	OA-3-am	6469
7590	07/07/2005			
Michael I. Kroll 171 Stillwell Lane Syosset, NY 11791			EXAMINER SWARTHOUT, BRENT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,813

Applicant(s)

AL-KHATEEB, OSAMA OTHMAN
MOSTAEEN

Examiner

Brent A. Swarthout

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2636

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 19 the claim should end with a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 9,10,12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 9, lines 2-3 "said power and monitor switch" has no antecedent basis.

In claim 10, line 2 "said image capture switch" has no antecedent basis.

In claim 12, lines 2-3 "said memory control switch" has no antecedent basis.

In claim 18, line 2 "the power and monitor switch" has no antecedent basis.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- a. Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Suzuki et al.

Lee discloses an image data analysis security camera comprising camera means 11 for scanning a field of view, conversion means to convert image into electrical signals (col.3, line 61), circuit for transferring images to remote location (col.1, lines 17-18), memory 15 for storing an initial

image, processing means for comparing image in memory with subsequent image (col.4, lines 2-5), alarm 13 communicating with processing means (col.4, line 6), and inherent power source, except for specifically stating that camera is remotely controlled.

Suzuki teaches desirability of remotely controlling camera functions in a surveillance system (abstract).

It would have been obvious to remotely control camera in a system as disclosed by Lee in order to allow a user of a surveillance system to operate plural cameras and to allow each to adjust the area of surveillance.

Regarding claim 2, Fig. 1a shows camera with lens.

Regarding claim 3, Lee teaches sensing changes in light of image (abstract), use of a chip versus other equivalent light sensing components being obvious in order to conserve space.

Regarding claim 4, Lee teaches desirability of overwriting images in memory (col. 4, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 7, since Lee teaches transmitting camera images to a remote location, choosing to transmit streaming video would have been obvious in order to continuously monitor an area under surveillance.

Regarding claim 8, Lee teaches use of transmitting data to monitor 12 or means 10 with recording means.

Regarding claims 9-10, choosing to use power on and image capture on switches would have been obvious, if it was desired to conserve power to a surveillance device.

Regarding claim 11, Lee teaches alarm if deviation between compared images exists (col.4, 5-8).

Regarding claim 12, choosing to not provide an alarm when image data was being updated would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since during an update the processing means would have no correct image to compare a new image to.

Regarding claim 13, Lee teaches use of power source (Fig. 4E).

Regarding claim 16, Suzuki teaches desirability of controlling plural cameras remotely.

Regarding claim 18, clearing memories when power is turned off is well known in the art in order to avoid having old data.

Regarding claim 19, Lee teaches use of system without monitor 12.

4. Claims 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Suzuki et al. and Mayer, Jr. et al.

Mayer teaches desirability in a remote control camera system of using a battery (col.3, line 11) and wireless communication (col.3, line 9).

It would have been obvious to use a battery and wireless control as suggested by Mayer in a remote camera control system as disclosed by Lee and

Art Unit: 2636

Suzuki, in order to reduce wiring and provide power when camera was placed in an area without convenient plug attachment.

5. Claims 5-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Iguchi, Yoshida and Ng disclose camera security systems.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass, can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/753,813

Page 6

Art Unit: 2636



Brent A Swarthout
Art Unit 2636

**BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**